

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4-7 are currently pending. Claims 1, and 4-6 are currently amended. Claims 2-3 are canceled. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Horie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,224,391, hereafter “Horie”); Claims 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Horie in view of Gauld et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,154, hereafter “Gauld”); and Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Horie in view of Gauld and Shieh (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,175).

Applicants note that the Examiner did not consider the foreign references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on October 3, 2005.

As stated in MPEP §609.04(a)(II):

Translations are not required to be filed unless they have been reduced to writing and are actually translations of what is contained in the non-English language information. If no translation is submitted, the examiner will consider the information in view of the concise explanation and insofar as it is understood on its face, e.g., **drawings**, chemical formulas, English language abstracts, in the same manner that non-English language information in Office search files is considered by examiners conducting searches. (Emphasis added).

A concise statement of the relevance of the submitted foreign references was included in the International Search Report for related International Application No. PCT/JP2004/005033, filed with the current application on October 3, 2005. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that all references listed in the previously submitted IDS be considered.

In view of the rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), Claim 1 has been amended to recite that a card main body is provided with a radio communication capability, a bridge member is provided with a wireless antenna, and rail members are provided with a flame ground contact for an inserted card which comes in contact with a flame ground contact of an additional card and the wireless antenna, and serves to ground the additional card and the wireless antenna to the information processing apparatus. Support for these features can be found on Fig. 3 and in its corresponding description in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a PC card including a card main body having a connection plug connectable to an information processing apparatus, and a card connector through which an additional card can be connected to add multiple capabilities to the information processing apparatus, a pair of parallel rail members configured to guide the additional card for insertion, a bridge member connected between the pair of parallel rail members in order not to block the insertion path, and the card main body is provided with a radio communication capability. The bridge member is provided with a wireless antenna and the rail members are provided with a flame ground contact for an inserted card which comes in contact with a flame ground contact of the additional card and the wireless antenna, and serves to ground the additional card and the wireless antenna to the information processing apparatus.

In a non-limiting example, Fig. 7 shows the PC card 2 with the bridge member 14 connected between the pair of parallel rail members 13 in order not to block the insertion path, and the bridge member 14 is provided with the wireless antenna 14b. In another non-limiting example, Fig. 3 shows the flame ground contact 16a for the inserted card entering the bridge member 14, which provides wireless antenna 14a (see Fig. 7).

The claimed PC card advantageously provides that the frame member of the PC card has a pair of flame ground contacts for the inserted card, in order to ground both the additional cards and the PC card at the same time (see Specification, page 9, lines 29-34).

The claimed PC card also advantageously provides that the same cable is used both as a high frequency cable and a power cable for lighting an LED, in order to implement the functions of the antenna structure and LED indicator in the bridge member. The high frequency cable is used to transmit high frequency signals, and the power cable for lighting the LED is used to transmit a DC signal (see Specification, page 10, lines 26-32).

Turning to the applied art, Horie is directed to a memory card adaptor card. Figs. 1-7 show the memory adaptor card 1 with a main body having a connector 6 with guide plates 53 through which a memory card 8 can be connected, a pair of guide rails 25, and a connector 5, which constituted a bridge member according to the outstanding Office Action, connected between the guide rails.

However, Horie fails to teach or suggest rail members provided with a flame ground contact for an inserted card which comes in contact with a flame ground contact of an additional card and a wireless antenna, and serves to ground the additional card and the wireless antenna to the information processing apparatus, as required by amended Claim 1.

The outstanding Office Action indicates that in Horie, element 3 (Figs. 2 and 5) constitutes a flame ground contact as recited in original Claim 2. However, element 3 is not a flame ground contact but rather it is a contact spring piece (see col. 5, lines 12-17). Therefore, Horie does not teach or suggest a flame ground contact as discussed above and as required by amended Claim 1. Gauld and Shieh have been considered regarding the above-noted features, but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Horie.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and all associated dependent claims patentably define over Horie, Gauld, and Shieh, either alone or in combination for at least the above-noted reasons.

Additionally, as recognized by the outstanding Office Action on page 3, Horie fails to teach a bridge member provided with a wireless antenna.

To cure these deficiencies, the outstanding Office Action relies on Gauld to teach a bridge member provided with a wireless antenna as recited in original Claim 3. Gauld is directed to a battery case for a PCMCIA card modem with an antenna. Gauld shows in Figs 1-2, a folding antenna 16 for a computer card modem located between a battery pack 12 and card modem 14.

However, Gauld fails to teach or suggest providing a wireless antenna on the bridge member of Horie.

As stated in MPEP §2142:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

The outstanding rejection, particularly with respect to the claimed feature directed to the a bridge member provided with a wireless antenna, does not meet the first criteria noted above. The outstanding Office Action indicates that connector 5 (Fig. 3) of Horie constitutes the claimed bridge member. The purpose of connector 5 is to house contact pins 54 which receive a memory card 8, and therefore connector 5 must be located in the center of the adaptor card 1.

On the contrary, the wireless antenna of Gauld is specifically positioned between a battery case 12 and the personal computer card 14 (Fig. 2, see col. 2, lines 17-23), and requires a coax connector 17 to connect to the PC card (see col. 2, lines 42-43). Thus, the connector 5 of Horie must house contact pins 54 in the center of the PC card, and the wireless antenna 16 of Gauld must connect to one end of the PC card via a coax connector 17.

Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify Horie to have the connector 5 provide a wireless antenna as taught by Gauld. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not met.

Furthermore, Shieh has been considered but fails to remedy the deficiencies of Horie and Gauld as discussed above with regards to independent Claim 1.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably defines over Horie, Gauld, and Shieh, either alone or in combination.

Application No. 10/551,845
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2006

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,140

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\SG\278836US\278836US-AM.DOC